POLITICAL INFLUENCE OF PERSIA IN SIND IN PRE-ISLAMIC TIMES

BY

NABI BAKHSH KHAN BALOCH

SELECTION FROM THE JOURNAL OF THE
SINDH HISTORICAL SOCIETY
(NOVEMBER 1946)

1946

Digitized by M. H. Panhwar Institute of Sindh Studies, Jamshoro.

POLITICAL INFLUENCE OF PERSIA IN SIND IN PRE-ISLAMIC TIMES

BY

BALOCH NABI BAKHSH KHAN, M. A.

1130, John Jay Hall, Columbia University New York.

(*Read before the Sind Historical Society on 28th November 1946*).

In tracing out the extent of the Persain political influence in Sind in the Pre-Islamic Period, I have mainly relied upon the Persian tradition incorporated in the Universal Arabic histories. The westerners' approach to this subject is somewhat different; they have found it convenient to explore this field through the Roman and Greek sources. There is a justification for this approach in so far as these works are helpful in checking the accounts of the native tradition, yet the latter cannot be sacrified for the sake of the former. European historians have given an absolute preference to the Greek and Roman historians and have even adopted their nomenclature; thus they have their Xerxes who might have preferred to call himself as Khusraw; there are other Romanised names which defy them with any of the known names of the Persian monarchs. There is also another disadvantage; Roman history instead of the Persian history looms large in these works. For instance, any layman consulting the History of Persia by Sykes will find out the impression as if it is mainly a Roman History which is only checked by such events as deal with the Perso Roman struggle. The whole narrative is therefore stripped off local colour as well as its national character. Therefore in order to preserve the spirit of the national history of Persia the use of the native tradition becomes very essential. As the ancient native tradition has already been thoroughly sifted by the most competent Arab historians it is a sufficiently reliable record of the dark ages, and a more thorough comparative study of these sources is bound to repay the labours of any serious student of this ancient history of Persia.

(i) Tabari's Universal History (Akhbar-al-Rus-wa-al Mulak) is too famous to need any comments for its authentic details. He has given a considerable account of the Persian Kings, and have utilised a number of original Persian sources available through the translations of Ibn-al-Muqaffa and (ii) Tha-a-libi (Abu Mansur Abd-al-Malik b. Muhammad b. Ismail) a later scholar who gave his special attention to the early Persian history and the surviving portion of his "Chosen chronicles of the Persian Kings and their Biographies (Ghurar Akhbar Muluk-al-Furs-wa Siyarlim) testifies to the historical acumen of this literary man.

Hamza al-Isphahani: "whose thorough researches upon the ancient Persian history are incorporated in his valuable chronological compedium "Chronology of the Kings of the earth and the Prophets" (Sini Muluk-al-Ard wa-al Ambiya). He made a comparative study of all the available sources on the

Digitized by M. H. Panhwar Institute of Sindh Studies, Jamshoro.

پاران ايم ايڇ پنھور انسٽيٽيوٽ آف سنڌ اسٽڊيز، ڄامشورو-

Ancient Persian history till he was able to compile the above authentic compedium. He says "I chanced to have eight manuscripts namely, (i) The Biographies of the Persian Kings translated (from the original Pahlavi) by Ibn al-Muqffa, (ii) The Biographies of the Persian Kings translated by Muhammad b. al Jahm al Barmaki, (iii) History of the Persian kings, a manuscript from Mamun's Library; (iv) the Biographies of the Persian kings by Zadwaik b. Shahwath of Isphahan; (v) The Biographies of the Persian Kings, translated and compiled by Muhammad b. Bahram b. Mityar of Isphahan; (vi) History of Sassanian kings compiled by Hisham b. Qasim of Isphahan; (vii) History of the Sassanian kings revised by Bahram b. Mardanshah Mobid (Priest) of Kura-Shapur;(viii) When I got these manuscripts, I compared them with another till I constructed the following chapter from them (1).

The kingdom of Sind being the next door neighbour of the huge Persian Empire, it often passed on under the political dominion of Persia. Now the Persian Empire is supposed to have existed for nearly four thousand years, but the kindom of Sind was not under its dominion during this whole period. Persia dominated in the Indus Valley only when the former could attain the height of its power during the long course of its chequered history. It appears that the Indus Valley may have been subjected to the Persian rule at the most three times; firstly, during the prehistoric reign of the Peshdadiyan monarchy; secondly during the semi-historic reign of the Kayanian rulers; and thirdly during the comparative historic period of the Sassaian Emperors. We will describe the nature of this political influence during these three periods in the following pages.

UNDER THE PESHADADYAN RULERS.

Presumably Persia must have had close political as well as cultural connections with Sind from the very earliest times. The Persian Empire which came to an end with the death of Yazdjird the last Sassanian in 32 A.H. or 652 A.D. is stated by the persian tradition to have originated with the inception of the Peshdadyan Dynasty as far back as four thousand years. (2). Whether the so called Peshdadiyan rulers flourished exactly four thousand years back or not, they may be conveniently regarded as the Persian Monarchs of the Pre-historic times, and the fictitious Persian tradition is able to trace the Perso-Indian connections rightly from them.

The very first king Hoshang is said to have resided in India for a long time in India (3), and Tahmurath is said to have uttered a wise maxim still being acted upon in India (4). But an important event of this Pre-historic period was the division of the large Persian Empire by Faridun, the contemporary monarch of the Prophet Abraham, between his three sons; to Araca (ارج) the younger he gave Iraq along with its western regions and the territories of India (5). This legend represents atleast a sort of cultural unity between Iraq and the western territories of India even in the Pre-historic times—a fact which might have warranted the inclusion of all these regions lying between the Indus and the Euphrates into one single zone to be placed under the rule of the same prince Araca. The idea of such a territorial zone persisted throughout the subsequent centuries and even in the days of Khusraw, Anushirwan, the historical sasoanad monarch, all the regions west of the Indus extending from the Oxus (جيحون) to the Euphrates and abutting upon the N. W. boundary line of India were regarded as Indian lands. (1). . Now all these Indian territories fell into the lot of fortunate Arya and he positively should have naturally been enamoured of the fertile regions of Sind and Iraq. Therefore the legend actully asserts that Manushihr one of the decendants of Arya and contemporary of the Prophet Moses performed the stupendous task of having dug up the river Mihran (Indus) through Sind and the rivers Euphrates and Tigris through Iraq (2). This tradition of the Pre-historic period is thus important is as much as it perpetuates the idea that Sind and Iraq were simultaneously under the Persian domination in the Pre-historic times; the reminiscent of his domination only could at best be preserved by the legend of the digging of these huge rivers. Moreover the universal character of this tradition has a considerable truth behind it and there could be no doubt that the Indus Valley was under the Persian political influence in these ancient times. Persian tradition invariably attributes the digging up of the Indus river to the Persian monarchs. The author of the Kitab-al-Badi-wa al-Tarikh states that *it is mentioned in the books of the Persians* that Jam Shadh dug up seven rivers one of them being " Nahr Mihran in the country of Sind". (3) The faint truth of this tradition may also be substantiated on philogical grounds. The name 'Mihran' which the Arabs found current in Sind for the Indus in the beginning of the eighth century A.D. and to which they gave a very wide publication through their universal histories and geographies is indeed of Perisan origin (4). The famous geographer Yaqut quoting the learned scholar Hamza of Isphahan states "Mihran is a foreign name (i.e. foreign to Arabic) applied to the river of Sind; according to Hamza its persian original is *Mihran-rudh* (i.e. river Mihran) (5). This testimony of Hamza of Isphahan, the master of Persian history and tradition quoted by no less authentic scholar than Yaqut is indeed very weighty and reliable (6) and it tends to show that the Persian influence in Sind may well be reckoned since the ancient rule of the Peshdadyan rulers of Persia.

---

(1) Hamza, Lepzig ed. pp. 9-10 also Kawiyani Press, Berlin, pp. 9-10. This valuable work has also been translated into English by our most learned Sindhi Scholar Dr. U. M. Daudpota, Director of Public Instruction in Sind.

(2) The total duration given by Hamza (p. 14) is 4071 years, 10 months and 12 days, while Masudi W. Tanbih variously states 4140 years, 5½ months and 4409 years 9 months and 12 days.

(3) Farsnama, p. 28; Ikhaldun II/155.

(4) Hamza, p. 24 (Kawiyani).

(5) Hamza, p. 25 (Kaviani; vide also Tabari I/227, 29. (6)

UNDER THE KAYANIYAN RULERS.

The Achaemenian occupation of Punjab or the more North Westerly frontier regions has been regarded as a historical event. It was during this period of occupation that the navigation of the Indus was ordered by Darius who describes himself as the son of Achaemenian in the Tablet of Bahistan. This therefore happened during the early Kayanid period and it is certain that during the reign of Kayanid the Persian political influence in Sind increased considerably. To follow the tradition in details, Kaikaus of this dynasty who is credited with a long reign of 150 years (1) is said to have established his sway on N. W. India and built a stronghold in Kashmir. This was followed by the conquest of Sind probably by his son Siaukhs (سياوخش) who, in order to commemorate this victory, built a stronghold in Sind, during the life time of his father and called it Mihrjan (2), after the famous Persian festival with which the victory might have coincided.

---

(1) Farsnama, p. 98.
(2) Hamza, p. 25 (Kaviani).
(3) Badi wa-al-Tarikh, (Europe Ed. p. 60).
(4) "Mihran" as the proper name of persons was widely current in Persia long before the Arab conquest of Sind. "Sabur Mihran was one of Ispahbads of the Persian provinces who rose in revolt against the Persian monarch ubadh B. Firuz (Ibn Khaldun II/176).
(5) Yaqut, Bulдan (Mihran) IV/697 (Europe Ed.)
(6) In Sind one often hears very novel and fantastic interpretations of the word Mihran, such as "Mih-ran", meaning small or large expanse of water; or indeed it may better be interpreted literally as "big desert". But these interpretations are all meaningless and cannot be supported by on the grounds of history or tradition.

His Successor Kaikhsraw put both Karman as well as Mukran the countries adjacent to Sind, under the direct rule of his uncle Babar-e-Zafira (بر زافره) (3) and Sind along with N. W.Indian territories probably remained in the hands of the native kings who are subordinate to their Persian overlords. For under his strong successor Kai-Lahrasp (4) who throughly reduced all the neighbouring kings to his subjection, *the kings of India* (presumably of Sind, Punjab and Indian frontiers rulers) along with others now began to pay regular annual taxation to this monarch (5). His son Bashtasp or Gustasp also had his attention on India and is said to have founded one town and some fire temples there and appointed Herabadha (هرابده) monks in them. (6).

REIGN OF KAI-BAHMAN AND FOUNDATION OF BAHMANABAD (BRAHMANABAD) IN SIND.

All the previous events are more or less buried into the mist of the prehistoric past. The rule of the famous Persian monarch Dirazdast Lougimanus Kai-Bahman, the grand-father of Darius II, opens up an historical era of the Persian occupation of Sind. The Persian hold upon Sind and N.W. India seems to have slackened by the time when Bahman Ardshir became the Emperor of Persia. He therefore started his campaigns against frontiers of India and first stormed the kingdom of Zabulistan (7). The frontier rulers as well as those of the Indus Valley seems to have succumbed before his onslaughts and he now placed both Sind as well as India (N. W.) under the direct rule of his own viceroys who governed these countries for him during his long rule of 112 years (8). One of these high officials named KarArdshir son of Daskal (كاردشير بن دشكل) raised a revolt against his supreme overlord Bahman, who therefore appointed another officer named Ikhshawvarsh (اخشويرش) in his place and ordered him to proceed against Kar Ardshir, the rebel. Ikhshawyarsh attacked Kar-Ardshir and killed him (9). These events shows that Bahman's hold on Sind and N. W. India was strong and continuous. It was most probably under his long and permanent rule that a second strategic town (the first one being Mihrajan) seems to have been founded in the heart of Sind and named after the powerful monarch as Bahmanabad which with the rise of the Brahmans was probably changed to Brahmanabad. Bahman was indeed a very great builder; besides numerous other towns, he founded prominent towns almost in every Province of his empire and called them after his own name. Though history unfortunately failed to preserve the account of these moveable towns, their strong foundations endured through ages to testify the acts of this great builder. One Bahmanabad was built by this Emperor in Khurasan, between Ray and Naisapur, and existence is mentioned by the geographers like IbnKhurdazbeh (1), Qudama (2), Istakari, IbnHaukal (3), and the author of Hudud-al-Alam (372 A. H.) (4); one who belonged to this town was known after the name of the town as Brahmanabadi (5). Now other important parts of Bahman Ardeshir's Empire, besides Khurasan were, the regions of the valley of the Indus, the Euphrates and the Tigris, i.e. Sind and Iraq. Now in Iraq (Sawad) also Bahman founded a city on the upper Zab, and though at first the name of Abedh-e-Ardshir was given to it, subsequently it became famous after the name of the monarch as Bahamania, which still existed when Tabari (868-932) wrote his Annals (6). Now the valley of the Indus, the administration of which was so carefully handled by the monarch, could not be left off without any memorial, we have the testimony of the author of Mujmil-al-Tawarikh, Shah Bahman founded one town defining the boundary line between the Turks and the Indians and called it Qandabil; another town he built in the land of Budha and called it Bahmanabad, the same as the people think it to be Mansura (7)." The reference is clearly to Brahmanabad of Sind History which was originally Bahmanabad, the town founded by Bahman Ardshir; during the rise of the Brahmans, Bahmanabad was more conveniently mutilated to Brahmanabad, though the name preserved its important suffix of "abad", permanently, pointing out to it's early Persian origin. The domination of the Brahmans over the city originally founded by the Persian monarch was indeed very ruthless. Qafund the Brahman Raja deputed his brother to the region of Mansura—to the very place which was originally held by the Persian Monarch Bahman and an idol temple was erected at the place of the original fire-temple (8). If such was the nature of the powerful Brahman domination the name of the Persian Monarch "Bahman" must have been wiped off from the name of capital which would have been now changed to " Brahmanabad" demonstrating the domination of the new political power.

---

(1) Hamza p. 25.

(2) Masudi (Muruj (II/132). If the tradition may have transplanted a later event in earlier times, it appears probable that this memorable town of Mihrjan may have originated the name of Mihran for the Indus. Having been founded on its banks, the river probably came to be distinguished as "Mihrjan-rudh" which was subsequently changed into "Mihran-rudh" or simply Mihran still in later times.

(3) Tabari I/613; (4) Hamza p. 25; (5) Tabari I/648.

كان كي لهراسب شديد القمع للملوك المحيطة و بعيد الهمة فكانت ملوك الروم والمغرب والهند
وغيرهم يحملون اليه في كل سنة وظيفة معروفة و اتاوة معلومة (الطبري × ٦٤٨١)

(6) Tabari I/675 and Tha-alibi p. 255;

(7) Hamza, p. 28; (8) Hamza, pp. 12-13; (9) Tabari I/252-253.

---

(1) Khurdabez, p. 23.

(2) Kudama (Kitab-al-Kharaj) published along with Khurdabeh's work, p. 201.

(3) Istakhari p. 284.

(4) Hudud-al-Alam, Persian text, Tehran, p. 56; Gibb Memorial English translation pp. 39, 102.

(5) Tarikh-e-Baihaq p. 204.

(6) Vide Tabari I/687.

(7) Mujmil-al-Tawarikh, Persian Text, Teheran, p. 117-118.

(8) Ibid, p. 119.

قفند کسي رابه ماهيد فرستاد برادرش راتاحد بهمن منصوره رود ...... از آنجا بگاه که بهمن قرار گرفته بود بجاي آتشکده بتخانه سازد (مجمل التواريخ ص ۱۱۹)

Persian domination over Sind may have continued on till the reign of Darius, but with his fall before Alexander, the Persian Empire relapsed into anarchy. The next line of Ashkanid rulers (the Parthians of History ?) who are said to have ruled about 350 years could not preserve the vast Persian Empire under their control and their political power was possibly confined to Iran proper. It was during their successors the Sassanids that Persia regained its political power and annexed all the original provinces of the vast Persian Empire.

Ardshir Papkhan (A. D. 226-240) the founder of the Sassanid dynasty in his eastern advance is said to have attacked India and levied tribute on Punjab (1). According to Ibn Khaldun, Ardshir extended his sway eastward and received the ambassadors of the Kings of Koshan, Mukran and Turan who all promised obedience to him after this, he turned to Bahrain (2). Thus Ardshir extended his power towards N. W. frontiers of India, Koshan probably being the Kushan king of N.W. Frontiers perhaps. Sind was not annexed till the reign of Sapur II; thus from the reign of Darius II till the accension of Sapur II, that is nearly for four hundred and fifty years (3) Sind remained outside the political influence of Persia.

Shapur II (310-379 A.D.) again reduced Sind and N.W. India to subjection and built permanent strongholds there. According to the authoritative statement of Farsnama "Shapur Dhu-al-Aktaf founded numerous cities.... in Sind and India; he founded Farshapur (Peshawar) (4) and some other towns. His memorials are numerous and the important ones have been mentioned" (5). According to Tabari, Shapur "founded many towns in Sind and Sijistan" (6). Indeed Shapur II firmly established Persian power in Sind and Western India and maintained his hold on these provinces through a lot of political activity. "Sapur. b. Hormuz Dhu-al- Aktaf" writes Thaalibi "wrote to the kings of Sind and India demanding tributes from them; so they took it upon themselves and subjected themselves to his commandments and sought his favour by means of gifts and money" (7). The political influence of Persia extended by Sapur II continued on till the days of Bahram Gur (420-440 A.D.) when a "*king of India*" presumably of the Indus Valley (8) through fear or favour, had to hand over the Sindian Province of Daubul, comprising the lower Indus valley as well as the Sindian port of Mukran, to this Persian

---

(1) Sykes p. 394.

(2) Ikhaldun II/169.

(3) According to Hamza's computation, (vide pp. 12-15), 28 years of the Kayanids from the reign of Darius II, plus 344 years of the Ashkanid rule, plus nearly 82 years of the Sassanids, till the accession of Sapur II; i.e. 28 plus 344 plus 82 equal to 454 years approximately.

(4) Also confirm Thaalibi, Ghurar p. 529; Nazhat-al-qulub, Persian text p. 254, translation p. 245 (Gibb Memorial). Tabari has Naysapur instead of Farshapur, but says "Indeed Shapur, son of Hormuz founded the city of Nag Sapur and many other towns in Sind and Sijistan (Seistan)". Tabari I/845 and after him Ibn Miskawaih in Tabari I/141.

(5) Farsnama, pp. 12-13

“شاپور ذو الاکتاف شهرهای بسیار بنا کرد / ...... در بلاد سند و هند فرشاپور و چند شهری دیگر و آثار او بسیار است اما آن قدر که معتبر است یاد کرده آمد الخ” فارس نامه ص ص
۱۲—۱۳

(6) Vide note 4 above.

(7) Thaalibi, Ghurar, p. 530.

Monarch who annexed the vast territories to his Empire. Apparently the Indian King gave away these provinces by way of dowary to the Persian Emperor whom he was also pleased to give his own daughter in marriage, but actually, it was due to the political pressure that he had to satisfy the Persian Monarch when he visited India.

Here we may pause a little to correct one common error. Bahram Gur's visit to India has generally been remembered as a pleasant trip in which he gallantly killed wild elephant and thus won the applause and favour of the native ruler who gave him his daughter in marriage. But on the whole, historical accounts indicate that he marched into India after he was with the Turks and indeed not all alone but at the head of a large army. The purpose of this visit was more of a political nature—to gather information about the internal political conditions in India and to display his own military strength before the Indian Kings. When Bahram Gur returns after his compaign's the Khakan of the Turks" observes Tabari "he appointed his brother Narsi in Khurasan and told him that he was going to India *in order to collect information about it and contrive some means to occupy some of the kingdoms of its people.*" (1) It was therefore that he set out in disguise but not without a powerful army at his back; the military nature of the expedition is fully borne out by the following account of Farsnama: "They collected numerous armies and set out for the lands of India; the Indian King sought the intercession of some nobles and peace was concluded. He gave his daughter in marriage to Bahram and besides handed over to him (the province) of Daibul and Mukran. Bahram returned with immense wealth—happy and successful. Since that year the Provinces of Daibul and Mukran go with the Province of Karman. The Indian King gave both these provinces to Bahram so that he may not attack his kingdom again" (2). Thus the great military exploit of Bahram ended in the annexation of two Sindian Provinces of Daibul and Mukran to the Persian satrapy of Karman and the revenue of these provinces was now directly paid to the Persian Emperor (3). This great success of Bahram was considered unparallel among the history of the Persian Monarchs and as such was gloriously applauded by the poets even long after him. (4).

---

(8) The conflict of Persian as undoubtedly with the Kings of the Indus Valley from Punjab right upto the Arabian Sea. The King who could give away the province of Daibul and Mukran should naturally have ruled at either Alor or Multan. Moreover Hamza records that Emperor Bahram Gur wrote to this "Indian King to send him the musicians and he sent him as many as twelve thousand of them. Then Bahram distributed them all over the Empire where they multiplied and "their descendants" says Hamza "still survive though they are few; they are the Zutt" (Hamza p. 38). Now the Zutt were Sindian tribe flourishing even "late as the conquest of Sind by the Arabs. Therefore it must have been some Sindian King who may have obliged the Persian Monarch.

Omar Khayyam:—
Bahram who all his life, was capturing the wild ass (Gur).
See how the grave (Gur) has captured Bahram.

(1) Tabari I/866).

(2) Farsnama p. 82.

” قول ان بهرام جور لما انصرف من غزوه خاقان الترکي ولى نرسي اخاه خراسان و اعلمه انه ماض الى بلاد الهند ليعرف اخبارها و ليتلطف لاحتياز بعض مملكة اهلها “ (طبري ١ × ٨٦٦)
لشکرها جمع آمدند و روی بلاد هند نهادند و ملک هند عبر و شفاعت ها در میان داشت و صلح کردند و دختر را بزنی بهرام داد و دیبل و مکران بجهرام داد و بهرام با مالهای بسیار باز گشت پیروز و با کام و از آن سال باز دیبل و مکران با اعمال کرمان می رود که ملک هند هر دو اعمال را ببهرام داد تا باز گشت و قصد ولایت او نکرد / فارس نامه ص ٨٢

(3) Tabari I/868; Ibn Miskawaih I/157.

(4) Says the poet.

Bahram Gur's immediate successors also pursued their policy of further territorial expansion of their Empire towards India. Feruz b. Yazdgerd founded many towns on the Indian frontiers the prominent ones among them being Ra-Feruz and Roshan Firuz on the skirts of the Indian territory (5). But the successors of Firuz were not strong enough to maintain their hold upon the eastern Indian possessions; during the reign A.D. 487-531 was deposed and imprisoned 498-501 for he supported Mazdak. Communist of Qudabh (the father of Khusraw Anushirwan) the Persian Empire became weak due to the internal disturbances resulting from the spread of Mazdaism (6) ; even the Ispahbad of Qubadh, Sapur Mihran revolted against his overlord and captured the outlying provinces (1). On account of these internal disturbances and the resulting weakness the Indian Provinces like Sind and Mukran threw down the yoke of Persian domination and became independent (2). At last, 531 A. D. Star of the Persian Empire rose high in Khusraw Anushirwan who saved the tottering empire from its downfall and re-conquered all the Indian Provinces. Anushirwan re-organised his army, equipped and strengthened his soldiers with arms, gave them their regular pay as well as advances, and then he went round his Empire and re-conquered all those countries which had been dominated by the local rulers on account of the weakness of Qubadh (father of Naushirwan), such as Sind, Zabulistan (Ghazna), Turkharistan (3) Bust, al-Rukhklaj (Arachosia), Durdistan, and Kabulistan (4). Khusraw Anushirwan established political supremacy of Persia throughout Asia and he was recognised by such great powers as the 'Epthalites (al-Hayatila), the Turks, the Chinese and the Indians; indeed political influence of Persia under him extended even to Kashmir, and Sarandip (Ceylon) (5). This wide extent of Anushirwan's power is confirmed by Ibu Miskawaih who quotes an account supposed to have been written by Kisra himself about his reign, and in which he himself says: "the ambassadors of Khakan the Great, of Khawarazm (khiva), of the kings of India, Dawar and Kabulshah, and of the King of Sarandip (Ceylon) Kala and numerous other ambassadors came to me (6). This is also fully borne out by the account of Masudi who says "The Kings of India and Sind, of North and South—and almost all the kingdoms submitted to Anushirwan, gifts were brought to him and deputations awaited upon him (7). The extension of Persian Political influence to Ceylon under Khusraw Naushirwan is confirmed by Hamza (8) and it appears that the Persian sea power dominated the whole western coast of India right upto Ceylon which might have extended the economical influence of Persia with the expansion of its huge trade. Khusraw Naushirwan, after the establishment of his power, followed a policy of appeasement and renunciation as a result of which the Kings of the Indus Valley and other frontier rulers were befriended and their ambassadors received at the royal court.

ولا راي ملكا (ملك-١ ؟) توبه (اصلو ؟) الملوك هكه با لسند و الهند و المعمور (الفغفور ؟)
بالصرف ولاراي ارد شير الفارسي و لا (ابن الفقيه الهمداني ص ٢٠٧)
كسري شهانها ان يلهو بشير بن

(5) Hamza pp. 38 and Mujmat Tawarikh p. 71.

(6) Iran under the Sassanids . Persian tr. p. 252.

(1) Ibn Khaldun 11/176

(2) Mujmil-al-Twarikh (p. 72) quoting an early Persian work Siyar-al-Muluk (سير الملوك) says that Bilash (بلاص) son of Firoz also had his adventures in India and succeeded in killing an Indian King after a very hard fight. But most probably with the death of Firoz , the Persian power began to decline till it was restored by Khusraw Anushirwan.

The successors of Anushriwan (590-628) seem to have well realized that they should also maintain their hold upon the neighbouring rulers through diplomatic relations. Thus Khusraw Purvez is said to have invited the kings of all the neighbouring countries to his kingdom and the historians record that "it was on a platform (الاكان) of stone in the town of Qarmisian near Karmanshah that the kings of the earth like Faghfur of China, the Khaqan of the Turks and Dahar the king of India (undoubtedly some king of the Indus Valley where the name was subsequently continued) the Caesar of Rome, and Khusraw Purvez met together" (1). These diplomatic relations helped the Sassanids to maintain their supremacy amongst the neighbouring powers; kings under their political influence continued to pay homage to their deserving superiors and often sent gifts to them to win their favour and patronage. The Indian Kings of the Western coast of India, who had also close economic relations with the Imperial Persia, used to send elephants and swords, while the Sindian rulers used to despatch such rarities as peacocks and parrots to please the Persian Monarchs (2).

But after Khusraw Purvez who ruled for 38 years (A. D. 590-628) (3), after Naushirwan, the Persian power declined (4). The Persian rulers lost their privileged position among the neighbouring powers, and almost all the subject countries declared their complete independence. In Sind the Brahman King Chach, soon after the death of Khusraw Purvez (628 A. D.) led an expedition to the Persian frontier of Makran and Karman and marked off the former western boundries of the Sindian kingdom; thus Makran was practically annexed by the Sindian ruler (5). But the diplomatic relations still continued on between Sind and Persia and the last Persian Emperor Yazdgerd having been hard pressed by the Arab armies appealed for help to the neighbouring powers. The Sindian Ruler due to his hostilities towards the Arabs was the first to respond to the call of the helpless Emperor and despatched a large Sindian army which attacked the Arab army on the borders of Makran (6). This hostile aggression on the part of the Sindian King was initially responsible for the Arab invasion of Sind in which the Sindian King fell before the Arabs along with its early overlords, the Emperors of Persia.[7] Thus Sind saw the change of its imperial masters from the Emperors of the Persia to the Caliphs of Damascus and Baghdad after a brief native rule of one century; the Persian political influence having finally come to an end in 628 A. D. with the death of Khusraw Pervez and the Arab rule having begun in 711 A. D. with the conquest of Muhammad bin Qusim.

ان انوشير وان قوي المقاتلة با الكراع والا سلحة و ادر لهم الا رزاق والوصال ثم طاق في النواحي مما لكة كلها وارتجع البلاد التي استولي عليها ملوك الاطراف لضعف قباذ كالسند و زابلستان و طخارستان و غيرها / غرر للثعالبي ص ٦١٠

Thaalibi, Ghurar p. 610, Farsnama p. 948, Ibukhaldun II/176.

(4) Tabari I/894.

وارتجع بلاد آ كالسند من مملكة فارس خرج بعضها من يد الملك قباذ الي ملوك الامم اعلل منه. و آ سباب و تها ا السند و بست و الرخج و زابلستان و طخارستان و دردستان و كابلستان

(الطبري ١ × ٨٩٤)

(5) Thaalibi, Ghurar, p. 615; and Ibn Miskawah, Tajarib, I/183.

(6) Ibn Miskawaih, Tajarib, I/200.

(7) Masudi, Muruj II/200 (Paris Edition); also c.f. Ibn. al-wardi, Kharita, p. 169.

SOME NOTES ON THE ABOVE PAPER

By N. M. BILLIMORIA.

Raverty in his Mihran of Sind page 197 writes:
The Zain-ul-Akhbar of Gardaizi, written in the reign of Sultan Furrukh-zad-of Ghaznih, about 445H (1052-54 A. D.) a rare and highly estimed chronical, states that " Bahman,son of Isfahndiyar, who used to be styled Ard-shir-i Darz Bazu, or of the long arm" and respecting whom, in connection with the tracts on the Sindhu, Ab-i-Sind or Indus, many traditions are related (and to some of which I have referred in my "Notes" above quoted respecting Bannu) "founded a city in the Zamin of Sind, which was named by him Bahman-abad or Bahman-nih and which they call (when he wrote) Mansuriyah". The author of the Mujmal-ut-Tawarikh, who wrote his work about 525H (1131 A. D.) quoting an old work from the Hindi language, translated in the year 417H (1026A. D.) the year which in Sultan Mahmud of Ghiznih or Ghaznin undertook the expedition against Som-nath says "in the time of Gushtasib, ruler of Iran Zamin, Bahman, his grandson surnamed Ard-shir, son of Isfandiyar, led an army into Hind and Sind and subdued a considerable portion of it. No member of the family of the ruler, named Sunagh, retained any power therein. Bahman founded a city between the frontiers or borders of the Hindus and Turks (the' Indo-Sythians' as they are styled) to which he gave the name of Kand-'il, and in another part, which they call Budah he founded a city which he named Bahman-abad, and according to one statement, this is Mansuriyah"., page 197.

According to Tod (Vol. II, page 44) the Rana of Odeypoor is descended from Bahman.

We also know from At-Tabari, as well as from many others that Nushirwan the just held extensive tracts of territory in the direction of Sind, if not in Sind itself. As to the influence of the sovereigns of Iran-Zamin in that direction, Al-Masudi states that Kai-Kaus founded the city of Kashmir, and that his son Siawakhs during his father's lifetime found a city in Sind called Mihr-jan. Al-Masudi also states that the kings of Sind and Hind and of all the countries of the north and south, sent ambassadors to Nushirwan with rich presents, and to enter into terms of peace with him, because of the greatness of his power, and strength of his armies, the extent of his dominions, his rapid conquests, and the vengence he had exercised upon so many kings and rulers, and also because of the justice of his rule.

Strabo in his 14th book, referring to the account of India given by Eratosthenes, which he considers to be the most credible account of that country says that at the time of the Greek invasion, the Indus was the boundary of India and Ariana, and in the possession of the Persians, and that, afterwards the Indians occupied a larger portion of Ariana, which they received from the Macedonians.

(1) Ibn al-Faqib al-Hamadani; Buldan, p. 217, Yaqub, Buldan) IV/69.
(2) Jaliz, Mahasin, wa-al-Addad p. 280.
(3) Hamza p. 22.
(4) Vide "Iran under the Sassanids", Persian translation by Rashid Yesmic, oo, 354, 356.
(5) Vide Fatahnama (erroneously called Chachnania) under the account of Chach.
Noshirwan—New King.
Anushak—Ruban—of immortal spirit, his vazir, Buzurgmihr.
(6) Tabari, under the account of Caliph Umar, has given a fairly large account of the Sindian attack. -
Battle of Nahavand A. D. 642.

In another place the author of the Muj-mal-ut-Tawarikh, in his account of Khalif son of Singar Semma "Kafand", a Hindu King contemporary with Alexander, the Macedonian says "it is stated that he, Kafand, Brahmin to Samid, his brother, directing him to go to Mansuriyah, expel the Iranis from the places which Bahman had conquered and erect idol temples in the place of fire temples." The author of course does not mean that this city was then called Mansuriyah, but Bahman-abad which they called Mansuriyah when he wrote.

There is no doubt what ever, that the rulers of Iran-Zamin from time to time had a considerable portion of the valley of the Indus and that up to the end of the reign of Nushirwan, the rulers of the western most parts of Hind including the ancient Turk rulers of Kabul of the Buddhist faith, were tributary to him. Subsequently when the Irani empire began to decay, some of these rulers began to regain their independence, and thus we find one dynasty of them, Hindus, under the title of "the Ran-khel" in possession of Sind and Mukran in one direction and Kabul in the other, and opposing the Arab forces in their advance eastwards. (see Raverty's Notes on Afghanistan, page 567).

The Gardaizi relates how Bahram-Gor, the Irani sovereign, came into Hind in disguise, and that Shermah, thinking that he was merely a person of a noble Irani family gave him his daughter in marriage and conferred upon him her dower Sind and Mukran.

Vincent A.Smith in his Early Hisotry of India writes:—

The fame of the king of the Deccan spread beyond the limits of India, and reached the ears of Khusru II, King of Persia, who, in the thirty-sixth year of his reign, 625-26 A.D., received a complimentary embassy from Pulikesin. The courtesy was reciprocated by a return embassy sent from Persia, which was received with due honour at the Indian Court. A large fresco painting in Cave 1 at Ajanta, although unhappily mutilated, is still easily recognizable as a vivid representation of the ceremonial attending the presentation of their credentials by the Persian envoys.

The picture, in addition to its interest as a contemporary record of unusual political relations between India and Persia is of the highest value as a landmark in the history of art. It not only fixis the date of some of the most important paintings at Ajanta, and so establishes a standard by which the date of others can be judged; but also proves, or goes a long way towards proving, that the Ajanta school of pictorial art was derived direct from Persia, and ultimately from Greece.

Col. Sykes in his History of Persia writes about Khusru Parviz and his Christian wife Sherin.

The game of polo was played by the Sassanian monarchs, and we read in the Pahlavi history, already mentioned, that the founder of the dynasty was sent for to the court of Ardwan, where he accompanied the King's sons both to the chase and to the polo ground. This is the earliest historical reference to Polo, so far as I know. Among the later monarchs, not only Khusru Parviz but even Sherin and her ladies played polo, as the following lines from Nizami prove:

When he (Khusru) reached the polo ground,
The fairy-faced ones curvetted on their steeds with joy.
They started play, when every moon,
Appeared a sun, and every partridge a hawk.
At times the Sun bore the ball, at times the moon.
Now Sherin won and now the Shah.

Ahmed bin Yahya, surnamed Abu Jaafar and called Biladuri or Bilazuri from his addiction to the electuary of the Malacca bean (bilazur) or anacardium lived about the middle of the ninth century of the Christian era at the court of Al-Mutawakkil the Abbasi, as an instructor of one of the royal princes. He died in A. D. 892-93. His work is styled the Futuh-ul-Buldan, the conquest of countries. He did not visit Sindh, but was in personal communication with men who had travelled far and wide.

Ibni Khurdadban a Musalman of Magian descent as his name signifies Died A. D. 912. He held high office under the Abbasi Khalifahs at Baghdad (Elliot, I, 13).

Abu Rihan Al Biruni was a native of Balkh, in Central Asia. He accompanied Mahmud of Ghazni to India in his expeditions and acquired an accurate knowledge of Sanskrit. His acquaintance with this language and Greek and his love of enquiry and research together with his fairness and impartiality makes his Indica a most valuable contribution to our information on India in the end of the tenth and beginning of the eleventh centuries. He finished his work after the death of his patron in A. D. 1030-31.

Abu Abdallah Muhammad Al Idrisi, a native of Ceuta in Morocco descended from the royal family of the Idrisi of that country; settled at the court of Roger II of Sicily, where and at whose desire he wrote his book The Nuzhat-ul-Mushtak or The Seeker's Delight, (Elliot I, 74). Almost all Al Idrisi's special information regarding Sindh and Western India is from Al-Jauhari Governor of Khurasan (A. D.892-899) whose knowledege of Sindh and the Indus valley is unusually complete and accurate.

RUMALA— is mentioned at pages 14, 87, 92 and 93 Vol. I, Elliot. It is first mentioned (page 14) by Ibni Khurdadbah (A. D. 912) as one of the countries of Sindh. It is next mentioned by Al Idrisi (end of the 11th century according to Elliot I, 74) as one of the places of the 8th section describing the coast of India, but is mentioned along with Nahrwira, Kandhar, and Kallabata (?). At page 92 (ditto) the same writer Idrisi says that Kallabata and Rumala are on the borders of the desert which separates Multan from Sijistan. Again at page 93 (ditto) Idrisi gives the distance between Kabata and Rumula as a distance of three days.

Zakariah Ibni Muhammad Al Kazwini, a native of Kazwin (Kasbin) in Persia wrote his Asar-ul-Bilad, or "Signs or Monuments of Countries" about

A. D. 1263 compiling it chiefly from the writings of Al Istakhri (A. D. 951) and Ibni Haukal (A.D. 976). He also frequently quotes Misar bin Muhalhil, a traveller who (A. D. 942) visited India and China. (Elliot,I, 94).

Tabari. Abu Jafar Mahommed ib Jarir ut-Tabari, 838-923. Arabian historian and theologian was born at Amol in Tabaristan (south of the Caspian) and studied at Rei (Rai), Bagdad, and in Syria and Egypt. Casr upon his own resources after his father's death, he was reduced to great poverty until he was appointed tutor to the son of the vizier "Ubaidallahibn Vahya. He afterwards journeyed to Egypt but soon returned to Bagdad, where he remained as a teacher of tradition and law until his death. His life was simple and dignified and characterized by extreme diligence. He is said to have often refused valuable gifts. A Shafite in law, he claimed the right to criticize all schools and ended by establishing a school of his own, in which however, he incurred the violent wrath of the Hanbalites.

His works are not numerous but two of them are very extensive. The one is the History of the Prophets and Kings, generally known as the Annals. This is a history from the creation to A. D. 915, and is renowned for its detail and accuracy. It has been published under the editorship of M.J. de Goeje in three series, comprising thirteen volumes with two extra volumes containing indices, introduction, and glossary. A Persian digest of this work made in 963 by the Samanid vizier al-Balai, has been translated into French by H. Zotenberg. A Turkish translation of this was published at Constantinople (1844).

His second great work was the commentary on the Koran which was marked by the same fullness of detail as the Annals. It has been published in thirty volumes with extra index volume at Cairo in 1902-1903.

A third great work as projected by Tabari. This was to be on the traditions of the companions &c. of Mahomet. It was noit however completed.

THE SASSANIANS IN SIND.

Extracts from Vol. VI. of A New History of the Indian people.

The Vakataka-Gupta age (200 A. D. to 500 A. D.) which is covered by the present volume of the New History of the Indian People is undoubtedly a very important epoch in Indian History. At the commencement of our period (c. 200 A. D.) the Kushanas and the Western Kshatrapas were the leading political powers, more powerful than any other state in the country. As the third century advanced the Kushanas were gradually ousted from the U. P. and the eastern Punjab, where the Maghas, the Nagas, the Yaudheyas and the Kunindas re-established their own independence. The rise of the Sassanians in Iran further weakened the Kushanas power, till eventully it sank into insignificance towards the end of the 3rd century A. D.

Owing to the dearth of original sources, the history of the Punjab, Afghanistan and Sindh, subsequent to the death of Vasudeva I (in c. 180 A. D.) is shrouded in considerable obscurity. There are no contemporary inscriptions to throw light upon the events in the political history of these provinces during the 3rd century A. D. Coins of the kings ruling in these provinces and their contemporaries in Iran and Bactria are almost the only reliable source of information. These, however, are not dated, and their legends also are incomplete or illegible.

THE PERIOD OF SASSANIAN ASCENDANCY.

The Kushano-Sassanian coinage issued by the Sassanian viceroys was current only in Balkh, Merv, and Samarkand; its specimens are not to be found in Afghanistan, Seistan or the Punjab. (These coins are called Kushano-Sassanian because the obverse is in imitation of the Sassanian coins and the reverse of the Kushana coins. Cunningham had described them as Scytho-Sassanian, but Kushano-Sassanian is no doubt a more accurate term.) I may state that Ernst Herzfeld has written an elaborate paper, with 4 plates, 40 illustrations of these coins in the Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India No. 38.

It is therefore, clear that for some time the Sassanians were content to occupy only the home provinces of the Kushanas. Their titles on the coins the King of the Kushanas' and ' the king of kings of the Kushanas' would further indicate that the Sassanians did not drive the Kushans out of Bactria, but only established their suzerainty over that province. Very probably some Kushana chiefs may have continued to rule as their feudatories.

The conquest of some Indian provinces of the Kushana empire was attempted and accomplished by the Sassanian emperor Varahran II. This ruler succeeded in annexing Afghanistan, North-Western Frontier Province, Seistan, and Sindh to the Sassanian empire (by c. 284 A. D.). Varahran II now transferred the crown prince Varahran III to Seistan as its Governor with the privilege of issuing coins with the title Sakan Shah, the king of the Sakas. We can understand the significance of this title of the crown-prince when we remember that Saka chiefs were in power in Sindh and Seistan for about two hundred years.. The Punjab was not conquered by the Sassanians; their coins are but rarely found in that province.

Afghanistan and the Indus valley continued to be under the Sassanian rule for about 80 years down to c. 360 A. D. There were frequent wars of succession during this period and therefore it was at one time thought that the Sassanian rule in the Indus Valley must have been very short lived. Inscriptions recently discovered at Persepolis show, however, that even in 310-11 A. D. when the reigning Sassanian emperor Shapur II was only a baby, his elder brother continued to rule in Seistan enjoying the titles, King of Sakastan, Minister of ministers of Sindh, Sakastan and Tularistan. The Sassanian rule in these regions was well established and organised; for the Persepolis inscription discovered by Herzfeld refers to a High Judge at Kabul and Minister of Public Instruction in Sakastzan (Sakatan andarzpet).

I quote from Herzfeld's Kushano-Sassanian Coins mentioned above pp. 35-36.

"Narseh (son of Shapur I) ruled from 293 to 302. In opposition to my former view I must lay stress here upon the new fact, that the internal war of 293 did not lead to the loss of Sakastan. This great realm continued to form an integral part of Iran. For, the two Pahlavi inscriptions of Persepolis that I had leisure to decipher in 1923, the first is written in the year II (?), i. e. 310-11, of Shapur II, by Shapur Sakanshah, an elder brother of the infant king, who has the titles *Sakansah hinde sakastan u tuxaristan dabiran dabir*, "king of Sakastan, minister of ministers of Sind, Sakastan and Tukharistan" and who is accompanied by the *Sakdstan andarzpet*, "the minister of Public Instruction of Sakastan" by the zrang satrap of Sistan (in the modern meaning of the name) and other dignitaries.

The second inscription is written by Slok, i. e. "Seleucus, high judge of Kabul, in the year 47 (?) of Shapur I, the numbers are much obliterated, who, according to their record, is paying a homage to Shapur Sakanshah as his superior, showing that even Kabul belonged to the lands governed by the Sakanshah at that time, and that the elder brother of the king ruled the country for an astonishingly long period. From these inscriptions it follows that Narseh must successfully have maintained all the Eastern possessions, not withstanding his apparently unsuccessful policy in the West."

We must however note that during the period of Sassanian ascendancy in Afghanistan and the Indus valley, some Saka and Kushana chiefs continued to rule as petty feudatories. Thus there was a feudatory Kushana family ruling at Kabul; for the wife of the Sassanian emperor Hormuzd II (303-309 A. D.) was a Kushana princess belonging to that family. It is quite possible that there may have been other Kushana and Saka feudatories in the Indus valley as well.

The rule of the Shakas and the Shiladas came to an end in 340 A. D. with the rise of a tribe, which is sometimes described as the Little Kushana, and sometimes as Kidara Kushana. Its chief Kidara, whose capital was at Peshawar, was originally a feudatory of the Sassanians, who were then supreme in Afghanistan and the Indus valley. On his early coins, the bust of Kidara is seen facing right, a convention which had to be followed by all the feudatories of the Sassanian empire. In course of time, however, Kidara conquered Kashmir and the Central Punjab. He now felt himself strong enough to assume independence and began to issue coins with the bust facing to the front, which was the privilege of the Sassanian emperor only. This step probably taken in c. 355 A. D. evoked imperial anger and reprisal. We find Shapur II encamped at Kabul in 356-7 A. D. and pursuing operations against his rebellious feudatory. He was successful in the venture; Kidara was compelled to acknowledge his suzerainty. We find him sending assistance to his liege in 359 A. D. when he was engaged in his Mesopotamian campaign.

The closer association with the imperial army probably enabled Kidara to realise its weak points and he began to mature plans for reasserting his independence. He secured the good will of Samudra-gupta, who had by this time extended his sphere of influence to the Punjab, by sending him presents along with professions of allegiance, and delivered his blows against Shapur II in 367-8 A. D. Kidara was successful in his undertaking; he annihilated one Sassanian army and drove away another, thought it was being led by Shapur himself. These victories enabled Kidara to consolidate his power in Gandhara, Kashmir, and the Western and Central Punjab. He appointed a number of satraps to rule these provinces.

Kidara was succeeded by his son Piro in 375 A. D. He defeated Ramagupta, the successor of Samudra-gupta, and compelled him to conclude an ignoble peace, requiring the surrender of the Gupta crowned queen.

The success of Piro was, however, short-lived; Shapur III (383-88 A. D.) took steps to avenge the defeat inflicted upon his predecessor and broke Piro's power. He was compelled to acknowledge the Sassanian suzerainty and issue coins as a feudatory with the bust facing the right instead of facing to front.

Along with the Ajmer-Udaipur tract, Sindh also must have slipped away from the hands of the Western Kshatrapas soon after this time they could not have effectively controlled it after the loss of the above territory. (222-238 A. D.). We however do not know who succeeded the Western Kshatrapas in Sindh and who was ruling there till 284 A. D. when the province passed under the sway of the Sassanians. Very probably some local Scythian chiefs were ruling there during this period.

In 284 A. D. the Sassanin emperor Varahran II conquered Seistan and Sindh and appointed his brother Varahran III as a governor of the new province with the title *Sakan Shah*. This event did not directly affect the fortunes of the Western Kshatrapas, for most probably they had already lost control over Sindh a few decades earlier. The local Saka chiefs in Sindh and Seistan had to transfer their allegiance to the Sassanian emperor after this conquest. There is no sufficient evidence to show that the eastern conquests of any Sassanian emperor in the 3rd century A.D. had extended to the Punjab or Gujarat and Kathiawar. Only one solitary coin has been found in the Punjab showing some Sassanian influence, and it cannot support the theory of Sassanian conquest of that province. The rulers of Avanti and Kathiawar are no doubt mentioned as recognising the title of Narseh (son of Shapur I) but they are expressly described as independent princes in the Paikuli inscription.

The conquest of Sindh by Varahran II brought Western Kshatrapas into closer contact with the Sassanians, and Bhartri-daman naturally felt it desirable to cultivate friendly relations with the new neighbours. He did not take part in the war of succession that ensued between Varahran III and Narseh, but when the latter came out successful, he sent ambassadors to congratulate him and to intimate his recognition of the new regime. The even tenor of the reign of Bhartri-daman was not affected by any events in contemporary Sassanian history.

(The Paikuli inscription mentions the king of Avanti as siding with Varahran III in the war of succession; but at this time Avanti or Ujjavini did not form part of the dominions of the Western Kshatrapas. Some local ruler of Avanti, probably a Saka may have joined the side of the Varahran III.)

It is important to note that the Allahabad eulogy of Samudragupta, which gives an exhaustive account of his conquests, does not mention any smashing defeat inflicted on the Sakas of Western India. Shapur II, the contemporary Sassanian emperor, is known to have led an expedition to the east in 357 A. D. Can it be that after conquering the Kidara king of the Punjab in 357 A.D. he turned to Kathiawar from his base in Sindh and totally eclipsed the power of Rudra-sena III for some time? . Had Sassanian coins been found in Kathiawar, this conjecture might have appeared probable; as it is, there is nothing to support it.

Digitized by M. H. Panhwar Institute of Sindh Studies, Jamshoro.

Digitized by M. H. Panhwar Institute of Sindh Studies, Jamshoro.